

Canadian
Pamphlets
03524

The Oregon question

Pamph
R Theo
O

THE ORGAN QUESTION

B CRITICALLY EXAMINED,

BY

A DISRUPTION ELDER.

SECOND EDITION.

APRIL, 1884.



London, Ont.:
FREE PRESS PRINTING CO., RICHMOND STREET.



THE ORGAN QUESTION CRITICALLY EXAMINED.

BY A DISRUPTION ELDER.

The word *Organ* is derived from the Greek word *Organon*. It is the invention of Jubal, if the Hebrew word *Hugab* is correctly translated in our English version of the Bible. It is the most perfect musical instrument known to man. It owes its present degree of perfection to Christian Forner, who, in the 17th century, invented the wind chest, by means of which an equal pressure of wind can be obtained in all the bellows. It is of various forms and dimensions. The largest is said to be in London, containing 183 stops, 4 manuals, with 10,000 pipes, and propelled by steam power. That in the cathedral church of Ulm is 90 feet high, 28 feet wide, its largest pipe is 13 inches in diameter, and is blown by 16 pairs of bellows. That at Seville has 100 stops and 5330 pipes, each stop being a particular set of pipes differing in pitch, but all having the same character of sound. That in Harlem is 103 feet high, and 50 feet wide. That in Breslau has 3342 pipes, the largest of which weighs 382 lbs., and is 55 feet long. From the earliest period it was used by the heathen at their idolatrous worship and festivities. It was first introduced into the Christian church by Pope Vitalian in A.D. 666—a strange coincidence, being the year corresponding with the number of the Beast. Notwithstanding the Pope's influence in that dark age, and subsequent ages, we learn from church history that that innovation was but slowly and very reluctantly entertained by the Christian church. The first that was known in the West was sent as a present to King Pepin by Constantinus Copronymus in A.D. 757, which he placed in the church of St. Corneille. In A.D. 1290 Marianus Sanutus introduced an organ into church service, which was then considered an innovation. Even in A.D. 1293 an organ was burnt in the Cathedral of Strasburg, which was supposed to have been done by the recusant worshippers. The student of history may easily see, that the Church of Rome, corrupt though she then was, struggled manfully against the innovation as blending Judaism with Christianity; for, says Thomas Aquinas, about six hundred years after its introduction, “in the old law God was praised with both musical instruments and human voices, but the Christian church does not use musical instruments to praise Him, lest she should seem to Judaise. It was strongly opposed in the Council of Trent, being retained in deference to the influence of the Emperor Ferdinand. In 1818, twenty-two]Jewish Rabbins, among whom were *Mordchai Benet* and *Moses Sopher*, decided against it. From the days of Hosipian to our own, its use has been a subject of debate. It was not common in England till the 10th century. As to the origin of the innovation in the pure worship of the true God, we may trace it principally to the indolence, illiterature and morals of the clergy of those times, combined with the mode of worship then prevalent. About this period, history informs us that, south of the Humber, there was scarcely a priest who understood the common prayerbook of the Church, or could translate the easiest Latin author into English. Tyn-dal testifies that they could not read their Portresses. At the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, some of

the Bishops could not sign their names.—*White's Bampton Lectures*. Nor did matters improve till the Reformation. Nor were their morals more commendable than their learning. These, say Clemangis and Lenfan, frequented the stews, and taverns, and spent their time eating, drinking, revelling, gaming and dancing; surfeited and drunk, these sacerdotal sensualists fought, shouted, roared and rioted, and blasphemed God and the saints, and passed from the embrace of the —— to the altar. Gildas, in the 6th century, paints the character of the British clergy in the darkest hue. Pope Innocent states that the amount of christian knowledge necessary for the laity is to know that there is a God who rewards the good, and for bishops and pastors to know the Apostles' Creed, and believe what the Church believes. Edgar, the British monarch, in the 10th century, assembled the British clergy, and in a speech addressed to a full convocation of them, told them to their face that they were lascivious in dress, insolent in manner, and filthy in conversation; that their time was devoted to revels, inebriations, debauchery and abominations; that their abodes were the haunts of harlots, and the scenes of the play, the dance and the song, which, in noisy dissipations, was often prolonged till midnight and morning. In one year eleven thousand priests paid tax to their bishops for permission to violate the seventh commandment.—*Daubene*. Nor was this all, for such was the protection afforded the clergy in crime, that it was proved to Henry II. in the 12th century, in the fifth year of his reign, that above one hundred ecclesiastics committed murder, for which none of them was punished by the laws of the Church, and the civil law then had but little power over them. These dignitaries, flaunting on the dignity of their office, with presumption for knowledge, and hypocrisy for divinity, passed their time in indolence and corruption; in rank equaling the nobility, and in hauteur preceding them*; instead of edifying the people with gospel doctrines and godly discourses, the time of worship was spent in singing and chanting numerous Psalms, to the exclusion of almost all other services. So much was this the case, that the human voice became enfeebled by such onerous exercises, hence a machine was substituted to regale the giddy and afford ease and repose to the deluded worshippers. Such was the general character of the clergy over all Europe in learning and morals when machine worship was introduced into the Christian church, nor did it improve till the Reformation—(*Edgar's Variation, ch. 18.*) In A.D. 816 it was enacted by the Council

*The rulers of the Church were then in the habit of keeping 60 horses in their stables, and using such a variety of wines at their tables, that it was impossible to taste the half of them. The inmates of some monasteries complained of the austerities of the times, when they were at ordinary meals reduced from sixteen to thirteen dishes.—*Bernard*. Hence the enactment in one of the British councils, that an Archbishop's train must not exceed forty or fifty horsemen, and that of a Bishop twenty or thirty; and that they must not visit their parishes with hunting dogs.—*Hart*. Cardinal Wolsey used to sit in a chair of gold, sleep in a golden bed, and a cover of gold-cloth spread over his table during meals. His household consisted of five hundred to eight hundred persons, many of them nobles.

of Castle-hyth (Ceale-hyth) that at the death of a Bishop, the following services were to be performed for the repose of his soul, the tenth of his property was to be given to the poor, all his slaves were to be liberated : at the sounding of a signal in the different parish churches the people should repair to the church and there sing thirty Psalms ; and that every Abbot and Bishop shall cause six hundred Psalms to be sung, one hundred and twenty masses to be celebrated, all the servants of God to fast one day, and that for thirty days immediately after service seven bells of pater-nosters shall be sung for him. In return for the kindness of Ethelwolf to the clergy, it was ordered in A.D. 837 that the clergy should meet with their people every Wednesday in the church and there sing fifty Psalms, and celebrate two masses for the king and nobility, who consented to the famous grant. In A.D. 928 it was enacted that the clergy were to sing fifty Psalms for the king every Friday in every monastery and cathedral church. And when death, the king of terrors, sealed the lips and closed the eyes of professing christians, the custom then was to wake the corpse during three days and three nights with continuous singing of Psalms before it was committed to its kindred dust and silent rest, hence the origin of machine worship in the Christian church, which, like many other corruptions, were copied from paganism, and had their origin in necessity.*—(Reeves' *Life of Columba*.) In these times public worship consisted chiefly in Psalmody ; in some churches and cathedrals this exercise was continued uninterruptedly day and night by a constant succession of priests and laity ; even private devotion in those times consisted in singing a prodigious number of Psalms as the most effectual way of appeasing the wrath of Heaven and atoning for the sins of the living and the dead. Nor was vocal music the only part of divine worship that was performed by substitution ; it was only a part of a system of worship by which almost every act of worship was performed by other agency than that of the understanding and heart of the worshipper. Fasting had the same privilege ; a rich person, who had many friends and dependents, might dispatch a seven years' fast in three days by procuring eight hundred and forty to fast with him on water and vegetables. So might preaching. Livings were then held by foreigners, who never visited the countries in which these livings were, nor understood the language of the people they were bound to instruct, so that unless they preached by proxy the people received no instruction at all, and the preaching that was then prevalent was composed of legendary tales and anile fables, which were ill adapted to enlighten or edify the hearers ; and, to stifle opposition, the same Pope ordered the service to be conducted in Latin, before that worship was always conducted in the language of the people. Some of these foreign pluralists even as late as the 14th century, held not fewer than twenty livings, which they never saw, and from which they derived ample revenues, indeed sometimes more than the then reigning sovereign of Britain. Nor was this all, livings given in *Commendam* were often kept vacant during the commendator's life, and sometimes during several lives, to the deprivation of extensive parishes of all religious instruction. A New Testa-

ment then would cost \$200,* and all ranks seemed to consider their priests so expert at saving souls as mountebanks are at performing tricks, and quacks at curing diseases, and that there was nothing to be done but commit their souls to their care and the business could not be miscarried. Nor need we wonder at such ignorance, as at that time few had books and fewer could read them, and fewer still could buy them, from the fact that King Alfred gave an estate for one volume on Cosmography ; and if a book was then lent, it was under a bond with good security that it would be safely and duly returned to the owner. (See Mosheim on the "State of Religion during the 9th Century.") "But," say the pro-organists, "we are commanded by God in Ps. 150 to praise Him with the organ." True, but that command refers to temple worship, with which we have nothing to do, literally, more than with the expression, "Be not merciful to any wicked transgressor."—Ps. 69, v. The temple, I say, all the services of which were shadowy and typical of good things to come, and received their completion in the antitype—Christ, under whose ministry we now worship, not according to the mode of worship practised in the temple, but according to the mode prescribed in the charter of the Christian church. "But," say the pro-organists, "there is no special injunction for the abolition of instrumental music in Divine worship, therefore it must still be scriptural to use it." If we associate with Chrisitan worship every part of the Mosaic ritual against which there is no special injunction, we shall have a strange heterogeneous commixture of Judaism and Christianity. Is there any special injunction for abrogating the prohibition of boiling a kid in its mother's milk ? which implies a prohibition of dressing meat with butter in the art of cooking, or for the annual capitation tax for the service of the sanctuary ? or for the appropriation of the hundredth part of the produce of the land for the support of the priesthood ? or for the triennial eucharistic feast for the poor, the stranger, the widow, the fatherless and the orphan ? or has the command against the sewing and wearing of heterogeneous commixtures been abrogated by special injunction ? Some of them implying one of the cardinal points of Christianity, that we are not to mingle our own righteousness with that of Christ's as a ground of justification. So it is with the 150th Ps., the command in the letter is dead, but in the spirit alive. In the Mosaic ritual, God was to be praised with instruments of His own appointment, and so in the Christian church, He must be praised with the instruments that He Himself prescribed, the spirit and understanding of the worshippers. Man has no better right to choose or to change the mode of worshipping the Deity than to choose or change the object of worship. Moreover, that the payment of tithes formed part of the worship of God when the Mosaic ritual was known only in the councils of Heaven, that they were in force during the Theocracy and till the dispersion of the Jewish nation, that Christ did not censure the Jews for their punctiliousness in the payment of tithes, but for the omission of what was of more importance, and that there is no special injunction given in Scripture for their abolition are facts too well known to require proof ; yet from New Testament development, few would have the presump-

*According to the Rule of Columbanus, published in Rome by Luc Holstein Deep in 1661, the Culdean Monks sometimes at certain hours sung thirty-six Psalms and twelve anthems, and in A.D. 1022 the Council of Worms commuted a fast of one day for the singing of fifty Psalms, and the singing of fifty Psalms for one hundred genuflections.—Fleury.

*In the reign of Edward I., the price of a Bible, fairly written, was £37. The hire of a labouring man was three half-pence a day. It would, therefore, have required the earnings of 5920 days, or, excluding Sabbaths, eighteen years and two hundred and eighty-six days, for a labouring man to have bought a Bible.

tion to maintain that gospel ministers have a right to or a claim on an hundredth part of the produce of the land for their support, or that they should be maintained as the Aaronic priesthood was, although their support on Scripture grounds is as valid as that of the latter, which may be attempted with as much propriety and with as much Scripture evidence as to maintain that the praise of God should be sung in the Christian church as it was in the Jewish ritual. But if it is urged that the command is to be understood literally, and that it is binding on us also *now*, as it was on the Jews *then*, if so, then we must praise Him with the *trumpet, harp, timbrel, psaltry, cimbal*, and the *dance*, all these are included in the command as well as the *organ*. The dance formed part of Jewish worship, and the command is an imperative to introduce it into Christian worship as the *organ*. What God joined let not man separate. Except in the case of Jephthoh's daughter, there is no mention among the ancient Israelites of dancing, but in connection with sacred songs and religious solemnities. But it is agreed that most of the Psalms have a primary and secondary meaning. Thus, the 2nd Psalm appears to be an inauguration hymn composed by David, the anointed of Jehovah, when with Him, crowned with victory and placed triumphant on the sacred hill of Zion. Yet, in Acts 4, xxv., we find the Apostle declaring it to be prophetic and descriptive of the exaltation of Christ, and of the opposition raised against the gospel both by Jews and Gentiles. In the 8th Psalm we suppose the writer to be setting forth the pre-eminence of man over the rest of the creation, but in Heb. 2, vi., we are informed that the supremacy conferred on the second Adam is there treated of. Of the 18th Ps. we are told in 2nd Sam., 22nd, that David spoke it before the Lord when delivered out of the hands of his enemies and of Saul; yet in Ro. 15, ix., it is adduced as proof that the Gentiles would glorify God for his mercy in Christ. In the 19th Ps., David seems to be speaking of the material heavens; yet Paul, in Ro. 10, xviii., applies it to the preaching of the Gospel. The 22nd Ps. Christ appropriates to himself, and the 18th v. was actually used by the chief priests when they reviled Him.—Math. 27. In the 40th Ps., we might suppose that David, in his own person, was declaring that obedience is better than sacrifice; yet, in Heb. 10, v., we learn that he is speaking of the incarnation of Christ. In the 41st Ps., we might suppose David to be speaking of the revolt of Achitophel; yet, in John 13, xviii., we find it applied to the traitor, and so of others also; and although all the Psalms are not quoted by Christ and his Apostles, yet what they *did-quote* serves for a key to the rest of them, the fathers who lived in purer times understood them thus, and so expounded them. Therefore, may we not suppose that the 150th Ps., in its primary meaning, refers to the instruments to be used in Temple service, and in its secondary meaning to those recommended by Paul—the spirit and understanding of the worshippers. But the Scriptures are not silent on, nor do they leave us in doubt how we should praise God—in spirit and understanding, says the Apostle. In I. Cor. 14, xv., it is so plain in the original that one may suppose that nothing but prejudice against the simplicity of gospel worship, blindness, or a determination to support a cause, could induce any person of piety to dispute its meaning. The original stands thus, “*Ti oun esti proseuxomia to pneumati, proseuxomia de kai to noi*, Psalo to pneumat, Psalo de kai to noi.” The conjunctive adverb *oun* always connects the preceding context with the sequence—the answer to the question

in the verse. The expression *Ti oun esti* is equivalent to the Latin *quid est egitur*, to which *faciendum* or *fieri* is understood by retaining the gerund in the connection it may well be translated, what must be done then? (in view of the context). Then comes the Apostle's answer, not in the third person, but in the first, indicating both the conclusion at which he arrived, and the resolution he had formed, and leaves them for the guidance of the Church in future ages, which conclusion is that the spirit and understanding of the worshippers are the only scriptural instruments for praising God in His Church. It appears from this verse that the Apostle, with prophetic vision, anticipated this corruption, for the word “spirit” in this connection evidently stands opposed to artistic instruments, and the word “understanding” stands opposed to worship in an unknown tongue, both of which were introduced by the same Pope about the same time, the result of which was that many of the worshippers left the Church, seeing they were not permitted to worship the Deity with spirit and understanding.—(See Baxter's Church History.) *Pneumati* and *Noi*, the Greek words for spirit and understanding, are in the original what grammarians term the dative of instrument; by the rule given in Greek grammars, the *cause, manner or instrument* is put in the dative, because they are the instruments prescribed by the true object of worship. In whatever connection we find the Greek verb *Psalto* associated with divine worship in the New Testament, it is to be performed, not with an instrument of art, but with one of nature, as the *lips, spirit, heart, or mind*—these are the only instruments authorized in the charter of the Christian church. The same word stands for *mind* and *understanding* in the original, and the word *kardia*—heart—is used synonymously with *mind*, generally implying the whole soul of man with all its faculties—not absolutely, but as they are all one principle of moral operation, as they concur in doing good or evil. The word “spirit” also in the original stands opposed to the rites, ceremonies, and pomp of external worship. God desires not the clanking of machinery, but pure, holy and spiritual worship; not the tinkling of brass and the flapping of bellows, but the emanation of a clean heart, real and unalloyed devotion. Under every dispensation, and in all possible circumstances, on earth or in heaven, external services are no further acceptable than as they spring from love. But is there love in a system of worship, the aim and object of which is to please the *creature* rather than the *Creator*, to sacrifice *principle* on the altar of *policy*, and to purchase *popularity* at the expense of *truth*? God demands spiritual worship, but to render such worship with a carnal instrument is impossible, neither can the carnal aid the spiritual.—John 6, lxiii. It may tend to aid what administers the spiritual, but not the spiritual itself. As the external expression of praise, God demands the fruit of the lips.—Heb. 13, xv. The fruit of the lips are words, but an organ cannot utter words, and music without words is not praise, nor music with words, although in harmony with Scripture, unless accompanied with the heart and understanding of the worshipper. It is the aim of the soul in praise that renders it acceptable to God, but an organ has neither soul nor aim, therefore its voice cannot be acceptable to Jehovah. True worship holds direct and immediate communion with God, worship by proxy never; praise forms part of worship as well as prayer. God prescribed the same instruments for both: by what authority, then, can the pro-organists apply mechanical aid to the one and not for the other, for machinery

can be applied to prayer as well as to praise. To praise God with the heart and voice of another person is as impossible as to pray to Him with the heart and voice of another; then, if we cannot praise the Deity with the heart and voice of another, much less can we praise Him with a heartless, lifeless machine, guided, perhaps, by an infidel. "But," say the pro-organists, "we do not praise God with an organ, it only aids." It may with as much propriety be said that we do not praise Him with the tongue, for the voice of the instrument forms part of the volume of praise, as well as the voice of the worshippers, being, as it were, the tongue of the congregation. The Head of the Church never prescribed such aid; it is carnal and selfish, consequently repulsive to God. It only ministers to the desires of the animal parts of man. That the voice should be accompanied by an instrument, no Bible student can deny, and that the apostle taught that is evident, but his language, combined with his practice, prove that it is an instrument whose mechanism is divine—the *Kardia* of the worshipper. The eye may affect the heart; what is touched, tasted, heard or handled may produce impressions on the mind, for good or evil, or deepen those already existing, but it cannot reconcile God and Mammon, for there is no compromise in truth. In Eph. 5, xix., the original is, *Adontes kai Psallantes in te kardia umon kurio*. Now, whatever difference may be made in the translation of these two Greek participles, that difference must be made in the music, and not in the instrument, for *Psallantes* refers to *kardia*, the heart of the worshipper, as well as *Adontes*. It is evident then, that the heart is the instrument here given, and nothing else. The latter appears to be expository of the former, implying a different strain or modulation on the same instrument. When the preposition *en* governs the *cause*, *manner*, or *instrument or means*, it should be translated *with*; on this point see the word in the Lexicons of Crusius, Donnegan, and Sir D. K. Sandford, hence a happier translation would have been *with the heart*. To maintain that it means that the heart should accompany the instrument is adding to what God said by his Apostles. Nor are we left to human comment on this point, for the same Apostle, in his epistle to the Colossians, inculcates the same doctrine, sometimes by cognate expressions, and sometimes by the same words: e. g., compare Eph. 1, vii. with Col. 1, xiv., Eph. 1, x. with Col. 1, xx., Eph. 3, ii. with Col. 1, xxxiii., and Eph. 5, xix. with Col. 3, xvi. Let us take the last verse in point. The original stands thus:—

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Eph.—*Psalmatis kai umnais kai odais Pneumatikais adontes en*
9 10 11 12 13 14 15
te kardia umon to kurio kai Psallantes.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Col.—*Psalmatis kai umnais kai odais Pneumatikais adontes en*
9 10 11 12 13 14 15
te kardia umon to kurio en chariti.

The Apostle evidently teaches the same doctrine in both verses, and that almost with the same words, and indicates the manner in which the singing is to be performed, with *en chariti*—with love—on the instrument *kardia*—the heart of the worshipper—just as he indicates by *Psallantes* the manner in which the singing is to be performed on the same instrument—*kardia*—in the adjoining verse, and whether *Psallentes* be translated *psalming*, *harping*, or *singing*, the instrument is the same on which or with which that *psalming*, *harping*, or *singing* is to be performed—the *kardia* of the worshipper, and nothing else. Both the

grace and melody are the offspring of the *heart*, and have no connection with any other instrument whatever. "But," say the pro-organists, "the Greek verb *psalto* was used in a more restricted sense and limited application than *Aeido* or *Melpo*, being more frequently associated with an instrument than those in Divine worship." True, and so it is here also. The instrument here given is the *heart*, the *sacrifice* is the *praise of God*.—Heb. 13, xv. The meaning of the expression then is, that the vibrations of the instrument—that is, the emotions of the heart—should accompany the oral enunciation of the lips, while singing the *praise of God*, and this tallies with the expression *en chariti* in the corresponding verse. To allege, as the pro-organists do, that *adontes* in this connection refers to vocal, and *psallentes* to instrumental music, is both absurd and untenable. "But," say they, "musical instruments, when used in Divine worship, were not typical of anything; they were merely appointed as an accompaniment to the Psalms that were sung at sacrifices and offerings, but not as an accompaniment to these sacrifices and offerings themselves." Quite the reverse, for during centuries before the Psalms were penned, or David born, instrumental music was appointed by God Himself to be an accompaniment to sacrifices and offerings.—Num. 10, x. The music of these instruments was to begin with the offering, continue while it was being offered, and terminate with it.—II. Chro. 29, xxvii., xxviii. It is impossible for any person to prove, by sound criticism or fair interpretation, that the particle *psallentes* in the New Testament refers to any instrument of worship other than that of nature; and had the Apostle intended to convey such an idea to his readers on the subject, the occasion was a most befitting one; besides, *psalto* is never used artistically in the New Testament. In Ro. 15, ix., it is correctly translated *sing*. In James 5, xiii., it is translated *sing Psalms*, but the word *Psalm* is not in the original. David's prediction of Christian praise, expressed by *Psalto*, (Ps. 18, xlxi.) is expressed by the author of Heb. by the verb *Hymneo*. The praise of Christ with his Apostles at the Last Supper, and also that of Paul and Silas, is expressed by the same verb.—Math. 26, xxx., Mark 14, xxvi., Acts 16, xxv. The other verb used in the Greek T. by angels and men expressing the praise of the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost under the guidance of the Apostle, and with which the Head of the Church enjoins all nations to praise Him is *aineo*, for neither of which is artistic aid pleaded. In the Greek language there is no verb that expresses the united double yet simultaneous action of playing and singing. But if instrumental music were not typical, tell what was its object, for it rendered no tribute or rational praise to the Almighty. It formed no part of Divine worship till God appointed it. He never appointed it till He instituted typical worship, and when He did appoint it it was as an integral part of typical worship to be used in temple service on special occasions. Its first application in worship by Divine authority was in connection with sacrifices, and it held that connection till they ceased to be offered. Therefore, being appointed by God Himself as an integral part of typical worship during the typical economy, it must have been typical, and have had its antitype like trumpets in the sweet sounds of the Gospel. Our best Divines teach that the Temple with all its furniture was typical, and if Davidic instruments were excepted, let our opponents prove it. It is also evident that they were not essential to spiritual worship, even during the Mosaic economy, from

the fact that from the call of Abraham till the erection of the Tabernacle, a period of four hundred years, and from that period till the reign of David, a period of four hundred and forty years, God's chosen people worshipped Him acceptably without Davidic instruments. Hence we see that for nearly half the time from the call of Abraham till the advent of Christ, His chosen people worshipped Him acceptably without Davidic instruments, which would not be permitted under a Theocracy were they essential to spiritual worship, but they were essential to carnal and typical worship—the ceremonial law. But we find them commencing with the reign of David and terminating with the Temple; consequently we have as good evidence for concluding that they were as typical as other parts of the sacred furniture, the typicality of which was never questioned. To maintain that God appointed as an essential part of His own worship, in a typical institution, during the typical economy, instruments that were neither typical nor essential to spiritual worship, and that these are now acceptable in worship which the Head of the Church declares must be offered in spirit and in truth is untenable. But even although it could be proved, which can never be done, that Davidic instruments in Temple worship were not typical of any thing on earth, but merely an external sensuous pedagogy permitted during pupilage, that would not justify their resumption now in opposition to Apostolic example and Scripture authority, in worship in which no voice is permitted, but what is edifying—I. Cor. 14, xxvi.—(a virtue of which an organ is destitute). more than the resumption of other Levitical accompaniments whose antitype is as obscure, the resumption of which would render worship ridiculous. Since then they were not essential to spiritual worship, nor could form any part of it, nor render any rational praise to the Almighty; they must have formed part of a system that was carnal and typical—that is, the ceremonial law. Be it also remembered, that although the ceremonial law was fixed, the ritual was both adoptive and expansive, and did not receive its full and perfect development till the reigns of David and Solomon. Expansive, I say, for in the *Mosaic Tabernacle* there were but few priests with one course of Levites, in the Temple there were many priests with twenty-four courses of Levites. In the Mosaic Tabernacle there was but one table of shew bread—in the Temple there were ten; in the Mosaic Tabernacle there was but one golden candlestick—in the Temple there were ten; in the Mosaic Tabernacle there were but two trumpets—in the Temple there were one hundred and twenty. Since then it is admitted that musical instruments in the Tabernacle during their infancy were typical; it must be admitted that they were typical in manhood during full and perfect development, for the Temple, with its worship and furniture, was the full and perfect development of the Tabernacle; and, while it is admitted that the priests with their instruments were typical, it requires more than human ingenuity to denude the Levites with their respective instruments of the same honour. On this point it should be remembered that the Levites were, by God's special appointment, consecrated to the service of Jehovah as well as the priests, that they derived their support from the same source as the priests; that they were the general though not the exclusive teachers of the people in morals and religion; that, when incapacitated by age for the active duties of the sanctuary, they still guided their younger brethren in the service of the Lord; that they were devoted to God instead of the first-born; that the first-born was a type of Christ,

and that type and antitype had not the relation of object and image, but only that of substance and shadow.—Heb. 10, i. Now, had these Levites exercised their instruments on a *theme* different from that of the priests, or over a different offering, or sacrifice, or altar, or at a different time, or had the place assigned them in the Temple when officiating been different from that of the priests, there might be some foundation for supposing that their instruments were not typical of the same as those of the priests; but, as their song was the same, of the same duration, sung or played over the same offering or sacrifice, on the same altar, in the same part of the Temple, and that, too, by the same authority, it is legitimate to conclude that their instruments were typical, of the same as that of the priests—that is, trumpets. But what places the matter beyond doubt is the fact that the pen of inspiration distinctly states that the trumpeters and singers—that is, the priests and Levites—were as one to make one sound in praising God over the same offering or sacrifice. Now, it is evident from the nature of their instruments, that that *oneness*, or *concert* was not in identity of sound, but in *end, aim* and *application*, and, while it is admitted that the priests with their instruments were typical, it requires more than human analysis to exclude the Levites with their respective instruments from the same honour.—II. Chr. 5, xii., xiii., II. Chr. 29, xxvii., xxviii., Ez. 3, xi. Add to this, that as the Divine model of Temple and Temple service given by God to David, embraced all instruments of all manner of Temple service, and all instruments of every kind of Temple service—I Chr. 28, xiv—it is impossible logically to assign to Davidic instruments a rank inferior to other sacred utensils, or deny them the typical nature ascribed to other things in the same model, whose typical character was never questioned. “But,” say they, “other denominations use it.” A spent arrow from an empty quiver: the question is not what numbers do or practice in Divine worship, but what the Bible authorizes, for number is no criterion of truth: the majority was for the *Golden Calf*, and Pilate condemned Christ to please the people. “But,” say our opponents, “David praised God with instruments, therefore it cannot be wrong to use them now.” David never worshipped in the Christian church; he was born 1085 years before Christ. The mode of worship that was *right then* would be *wrong now*. To prefer the example of David to that of David's Lord is as foolish as to prefer the example of Homer's heroes to that of the Apostles of Christ. “But,” say the pro-organists, “instrumental music is but a circumstance of worship.” Well, if so *now*, it must have been a circumstance of worship in the Temple, also a dogma which is untenable, since it was essential to Temple service, neither is it a circumstance in Christian worship, for the artificial as well as the natural voice forms part of the worship. “But,” say they, “we mean well, and God regards the intention of the worshipper.” So did the Samaritans, yet Christ told them that their worship was wrong. Paul was sincere before his conversion, yet that did not justify his conduct. If I regard iniquity in my heart, God will not hearken to my prayers.—Ps. 66. “But,” say the pro-organists, “what is not forbidden is allowable.” By no means; that dangerous dogma sanctions all the novelties of Popery: “Who required this of your hand.”—Isaiah 1, xii. The want of command amounts to a prohibition; many things are forbidden by implication that are not by injunction. “But,” say they, “God is praised with harps in Heaven.” True, but they are

of Divine mechanism, harped with spirits, the very instruments for which we contend. To add voluntarily to a rule of duty implies that God gave a defective rule; and to worship the Deity in a mode which he did not order, is offering Him the sacrifice of fools.—Ecc. 5, i. “But,” say they, “expediency pleads for it.” Quite the reverse; expediency may indeed be pleaded for in behalf of some things relating to the worship of God, which should be regulated with discretion, such as *time*, *place* and *expense*, but as to the mode of worshipping the Deity, it is fixed by the voice of inspiration, and is as immutable as Himself, except by Himself. Moreover, expediency implies difficulties, impediments, want of power, and restraints, all which are inconsistent with the simplicity and freedom of Gospel worship, and also incompatible with the Apostolic injunction, “Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made you free, and be not again entangled with the yoke of bondage.” The bondage here spoken of is the ceremonial law, of which instrumental music formed part, and terminated at the resurrection of Christ, the antitype—Him who is greater than the Temple, and whose prescribed mode of worship cannot be tampered with impunity, seeing that it was for outstepping the prescribed mode and limits of the worship of Jehovah that two young priests were slain with fire from Heaven at the door of the Tabernacle.—Lev. 10, i. Nor can any valid arguments from New Testament development be adduced on the grounds of expediency for singing machines, that cannot with equal propriety be adduced for praying ones, for both are declared by the pen of inspiration to be the same, the spirit and understanding of the worshippers, but not the spirit and understanding of the organist, who perhaps may be an infidel, while he leads the Psalmody of the congregation. The heathen, from time immemorial to the present time, worshipped their gods with machinery, in size from the queen to the ponderous fabric propelled by water power, night and day unceasingly praying to their dumb idols. Nor can we suppose that a wind instrument and the sound of brass can be more acceptable to Jehovah (repulsive should I say?) when used without His order in divine worship than an hydraulic one, and the sound of water, seeing He is the Creator of both elements. But expediency is not a moral agent or foundation on which to build in holy things; it may be, and often is, employed to effect evil as well as good, vice as well as virtue, according to the caprice of the agent that employs it. It settles nothing permanently; it de-thrones the jurisdiction of conscience, and by its operation morality is reduced to a matter of calculation of profit and loss, and becomes subservient to the advancement of secular interests and passions, rather than a helpmeet to the advancement of Christian ethics and refinement. It is as often employed to crush freedom and virtue as to promote them. It fortifies the tyrant in his despotism, the most flagitious criminal in his horrid machinations, as well as the reformers and benefactors of mankind in their laudable undertakings. It is the offspring of worldly policy and low cunning, the growth of restraint and progeny of famine, rather than that of virtue and Godly edification; it delights in the haunts of selfishness rather than in the glorious liberty of the children of God; a lever whose fulcrum is as Protean and unreliable as it is unscriptural—a lawyer’s last shift in a bad cause. In the case under consideration, it can only be employed as a plea to promote the best interests of the Redeemer’s Kingdom, for which we have neither evidence nor prospect, but the reverse, if we judge

from past experience. Is it expedient to wound the feelings of the pious? to regale the giddy rather than edify the thoughtful? to place a stumbling-block before the weak and tamper with the strong? to produce a disruption in the Church? to introduce into the Church a baneful rag of Popery that committed its fell work in days of yore, and was expelled the Church at the Reformation? To entertain the innovation of a foreign priesthood, that was the chief cause for which two thousand Puritan divines laid on the altar of conscience all that was dear to nature, forwent every prospect present and prospective, left their churches as funeral monuments of their religion, their abodes a lasting witness of the intolerance of their oppressors, passed their days in exile, or in dens and caves of the earth, rather than entertain this toy of Popery which the pro-organists now would fondly embrace and nourish in their bosoms. “For,” say these Divines writing from exile, “why should we borrow from Popery? The dispute is not about the cup and surplice; there are other grievances that ought to be redressed or dispensed with, as the *organ* in Divine worship.”—See *Zuric Letters*. Moreover, it is agreed by Divines that nothing should be done in Divine worship by human laws or expediency which cannot be determined by Scripture. Therefore, let the pro-organists go to their charter, and there prove their right to that for which they are now pleading, and if successful they may obtain with honour the object of their desire, rather than drag it into the Christian church with drooping plumes through the back door of expediency under the frown of their more pious brethren. But expediency is permissive only in this case in things that are scriptural, therefore it devolves on the pro-organists to prove that the use of instrumental music in Divine worship is scriptural before they can consistently plead for its introduction into the Christian church, even on the ground of expediency, notwithstanding they endeavor to drag this offspring of an Italian imposter Pope Vitalian I. into the Christian Church, through the elastic valves of expediency under the guise of aid and edification without a single text from the New Testament to support them, and against the practice of the primitive Church for the first 670 years. The Apostle that was made all things for all men, that he might save some; that could wish himself accursed from Christ for his brethren the Jews; that condescended to circumcise Timothy to accommodate their prejudice; that temporised with a Jewish rite (Acts 21, xxiv.) to rectify their judgment, modify their prejudice and promote his usefulness, would certainly introduce instrumental music into the Christian church as a most attractive expedient to conciliate the Jews and disarm their prejudice, had such been in accordance with the mind of the spirit. But, no; there is not a single instance on record in the Volumes of Inspiration of *Him* or of any of the Apostles having recourse to expediency in the mode of worship in the Christian church; their expediency was relating to worship, not *in* worship. In the case of Timothy, it was to render him more acceptable to the Jews; and in that of Paul, to efface a slander that was calculated to destroy his usefulness as a minister of Christ; Aaron’s expediency in the mode of worship was indorsed with the frown of Heaven; and that of Moses averse marriage had no countenance from David’s Lord. “But,” say the pro-organists, “we use instrumental music to aid the voice, enrich the vocal melody and enliven devotion.” Such aid is unscriptural, sinking the carnal in the spiritual, destroying the melody of the heart, therefore repulsive to God. But, although it would prove an

aid in acquiring the art of singing and the science of music, that aid should be employed in a preparatory institution, not in the House of God—higher aid should be aimed at; nor can that plea justify its adoption more than the adoption of images and rosaries as an aid to prayer. Nor are our opponents more consistent on the plea of Christian forbearance, for they claim to be more enlightened and refined in Christian knowledge and sentiments than their brethren, yet plead forbearance from their less enlightened brethren, whereas the Apostle pleads for forbearance from the strong for the weak. Moreover, the radical idea of the term "forbearance" is that of withholding or restraining for a time the strict exercise of rigorous justice, and implies something amiss or wrong on the part of those who plead for it, and is in fact equivalent to a confession of error. That the beggarly elements for returning to which the Galatians were censured, were the law of commandments, contained in ordinances; that these commandments were the ordinances—that is, the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish church—that these were abolished, blotted out, taken out of the way, and nailed to the *Cross* of Christ; that instrumental music formed part of these, and that that part was appointed by God Himself, and that these instruments were typical of the joyful sound—the preaching and worship of Him who is the substance of all the types and shadows of the law of Moses—the true temple, altar, priest and sacrifice, David's Lord and son, are facts that cannot be disproved. Moreover, that the ceremonial law continued from Moses till Solomon, when it merged into the Temple; that it was practised in its most scriptural form during that period, that instrumental music formed part of its worship as well as sacrifices—II. Chr. 29, xxv., xxvi., xxvii., xxviii.—that the Apostle in Heb. 9, x. sums up the ceremonial law without a single exception to consist in meats and drinks and divers washings and carnal ordinances, that is, external or sensuous ordinances of which instrumental music was one, and that all these were to continue but for a limited period, for, says the Apostle, imposed only—that is, appointed *only*—till the time of the Reformation, the Gospel dispensation is as plain as language can express it, and cannot be disproved, and unless the pro-organists prove that instrumental music was excepted, their plea becomes quite untenable. It is also worthy of notice that vocal as well as instrumental music was employed in Divine worship, before the ceremonial law was given, as well as in the Tabernacle and Temple after it was given; that the former was retained in Christian worship we have ample proof, that the latter, we have none. Add to this that from the time of Moses till the ministry of Christ, and during its continuance—the duration of the ceremonial law—the Jews were accustomed by Divine command to assemble on Sabbath and at other stated times in the *Proseuche* or Synagogue for the worship of God and to receive religious instruction from holy men appointed by God for that purpose; that there is no evidence that instrumental music was used in the Synagogue during that period, nor in the Temple during the presence of our Lord, but was confined to the services of the Tabernacle and Temple chiefly in sacrificial services, are facts that cannot be disproved. The services of the Synagogue were moral, and the model from which the Christian church borrowed much of her discipline, whereas those of the Tabernacle and Temple were typical and vanished away; nor is there in the Christian church any part of worship corresponding with the model of Temple service, but corresponding with the model of the service of the

Synagogue she has much—Christian Circumcision and the Passover: Baptism and the Lord's Supper—for these rites were never performed in the Temple, but in the Synagogue or in private houses. Besides, the Jews were commanded only to attend the services of the Temple thrice a year, those of the Synagogue every Sabbath. "But," say the pro-organists, "instrumental music was introduced into Divine worship by David without Divine authority, and God approved of it." By no means; instrumental music was first introduced into Divine worship by Moses, by order of Jehovah. David added to the number of instruments, but he never introduced a single instrument without the express order of Jehovah.—II. Chr. 29, xxv.—for so was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets, says the Bible. "But," say they, "instrumental music was not added to the ceremonial law when given to Moses in the Tabernacle, therefore it can form no part of it." If it was not *then* added to the ceremonial law, the ceremonial law was *then* added to it, and also to other parts of it which were employed in the worship of God, before the ceremonial law was given to Moses in the Tabernacle, but afterward embraced in the Mosaic ceremonial law. By parity of reasoning, the pro-organists may reject as part of the ceremonial law the *Passover*, *sacrifices*, the distinction between *clean* and *unclean animals*, the prohibition of *blood circumcision*, and others, as these were employed in Divine worship before the ceremonial law was given to Moses in the Tabernacle, but afterwards embraced in and incorporated in the Divine code. Moses, by the command of Jehovah, formed for the nation a full and regular system of ceremonial laws, such rites as had been before in use. He sanctioned with new authority and prescribed with particular care the proper time and manner of observing them. For some time only two instruments were used in Divine worship, and from time to time the number was increased; but none was ever added without the express order of Jehovah.—Num. 10, ii., II. Chr. 29, xxv., xxvi., xxvii., xxviii. To Moses was given the Divine model for the Tabernacle, with all its furniture—Ex. 25—and to David the Divine model of the Temple, *including all instruments of all manner of service, and all instruments of every kind of service*—I. Ch. 28, xiv.—consequently Davidic instruments were not omitted. The Temple was the perfect development of the Tabernacle. The one hundred and twenty trumpets, with their Levitic kin, during the reign of Solomon, formed part of the ceremonial law as well as the Mosaic trumpets. The high priest was a type of Christ, the priests and Levites of His ministers; the different instruments with their different sounds and voices might typify the different instruments and tongues that would be employed in future ages to propagate the joyful sound of the gospel. But if instrumental music formed no part of the ceremonial law, as the pro-organists allege, of what law then did it form part, for it must have formed part of some law. It is certain that it formed no part of the *Moral Law*, for if it did Christ would have used it, nor yet of the *Judicial Law*; and although it had, that would avail nothing, for it also was abolished as well as the *Ceremonial Law*, except what was founded in the laws of nature, and common to all mankind; therefore, it must have formed part of the *Ceremonial Law* or of none, for the Jews had only these three. To maintain that it formed part of none, that is that it was a rite *per se*, is untenable, for by Divine command (Num. 10, x., II. Chr. 29, xxv.) it was ordered to be an accompaniment to sacrifices and offerings, therefore, being part of the ceremonial

law, it was swept away with the Temple and its worship, consequently the commissioned servants of the Lord who planted the Christian church never used it, and we are in duty bound to follow their example. Besides, if instrumental music formed no part of the ceremonial law, then the ceremonial law could be properly kept without it; but take away instrumental music from the ceremonial law, and to keep it according to God's appointment would be impossible. The Temple service could not be carried on according to God's appointment without the Levites (an order not in the Christian church), and the Levites could not discharge their respective functions without their respective instruments, more than an engine would operate without its cylinder. The conclusion is irresistible and plain as any demonstration in Euclid that it formed not only a part of it, but a most essential part too, otherwise sacrifices did not, for by Divine command the one formed part of the Temple service as well as the other, and they were both abandoned at the same time by the same authority—Christ and His Apostles. Further, the moral law has its reason within itself, and finds its end directly and immediately answered in the obedience which it receives; but the ceremonial law had its reason without itself, and viewed its end beyond itself in something other than what it was actually performing; and as every whole is composed of its several parts, and every part of a body partakes of the nature of the body of which it formed part, if instrumental music formed part of the moral law it must have had its reason within itself. But what reason had it within itself? None. Or did the moral law in any way receive any part of its end directly and immediately answered by instrumental music? None. Then it could not have formed part of it. But view it in connection with the ceremonial law, and we see its reason beyond itself; we see also its end indirectly and inmediately in the future, for during its action we see it contemplating something other than what it was actually performing, for while beholding a band of priests and Levites exercising their instruments over a sacrifice typifying the death of the Son of God, we behold in type the heralds of the Cross, recommending Christ the one and only perfect sacrifice as the only way of salvation to a guilty and perishing world, whereas no such rational explanation can be given of its use and extinction in connection with any other law. Also, the Lord Jesus declares that he came not to destroy the laws, but to fulfil them. But to fulfil a law is not to abrogate it, but to answer its requirements by obedience. Then if instrumental music formed part of the moral law, it was consecrated by Christ and is still in force; but there is no evidence that Christ in any way consecrated instrumental music or answered its requirements by His obedience to the moral law, consequently it must have formed part of some law other than the moral. But there is ample evidence that He fulfilled its requirements just as He fulfilled the requirements of other parts of the ceremonial law, for He fulfilled every part of the ceremonial law, by bringing to pass all that is typified, as well as He fulfilled the moral law by His active and passive obedience. He offered Himself a perfect sacrifice for the sins of the world, His humanity on the altar of His Divinity—the sacrifices and offerings offered during the Levitical law were the type of His own perfect sacrifice and offering. Instrumental music was the divinely and essentially appointed accompaniment of these sacrifices—*essentially*, for so much was this the case that they could not be offered according to God's appointment without it.—Num. 10, x., II. Chr. 29, xxviii., I. Chr. 28,

xiii., xiv. Now, to maintain that a divinely appointed rite which was an essential accompaniment to the most solemn part of the ceremonial law formed no part of it, is both presumptuous and untenable; if it formed no part of it, it was both useless and unnecessary in its connection. But to maintain that the Deity appointed as an essential accompaniment to the most significant part of His own worship what is both useless and unnecessary impeaches His wisdom; and as it is evident that every part of the ceremonial law was abandoned on meeting its antitype, and as instrumental music was abandoned with altars and sacrifices of which it was an essential and divinely appointed accompaniment, it is impossible to assign a satisfactory reason for its disuse and absence in the primitive church, otherwise than is assigned for altars, sacrifices and other parts of the same ceremony. The fact is, vocal music formed part of the moral law and is still in force, being consecrated by the Head of the Church, whereas instrumental music—its accompaniment—formed part of another law which merged into its antitype and vanished away—just like prayer and its accompaniment incense; the former, like vocal music, is founded on the moral law and is eternal, the latter on the ceremonial law and was abolished. The Jewish converts appear to have understood this distinction well, for notwithstanding the rigid tenacity with which they adhered to their ancient ritual, and the zeal of the Apostles to prevent their engraving the Jewish ritual on the worship of the Christian church, till Popery unfurled her banner in the Vatican, not a voice is heard in favor of Davidic instruments, nor a single interposition of Providence for their preservation, nor a sigh of regret for their absence, but a woe is denounced against those who use them.—Am. ch. 6. And as it was to prove that their end was accomplished, God permitted them to be carried into captivity to grace the triumph of a heathen emperor and consecrated to a heathen *goddess*. Besides, he not only fulfilled the laws, both moral and ceremonial, in every point, even to the minutest, in completing their designs, in fulfilling their predictions, and in accomplishing what was intended in them.—Math. 5, xvii., xviii. But He also magnified them and made them honourable.—Isaiah 42, xxi. By His suffering in bearing its curse, He magnified and honoured the holiness and justice of the moral law. By His death He magnified it and made it honourable by giving it a lustre, greatness, glory and majesty in the sight of all worlds. He magnified and honoured circumcision by shedding the first part of His blood while undergoing it. He magnified and honoured the *Passover* by keeping it and becoming our *Passover*. He magnified and honoured the *altar* by becoming the true altar Himself. He magnified and honoured the *sacrifice* by offering Himself the only perfect sacrifice. But how did He honour instrumental music, the essential and divinely appointed accompaniment of sacrifice, the most significant part of the ceremonial law, except in antitype, by preaching the gospel, we defy our opponents to unfold. Further, if the instruments of David were not typical and abolished, tell what constitutes abolition; that they were disused and abandoned and were spoken of with contempt—I. Cor. 13—by the founders of Christianity, and for centuries afterwards, is undeniable. Now, if these are not proofs sufficient, tell what is, for we have no better proof of the abrogation of other parts of the Jewish ritual which are neither disputed nor retained, and whose antitype is unknown.—I. Chr. 28, xv., xvi. But have we not a good evidence that the instruments of David were abolished in the New Testament as we

have that they were adopted in the Old Testament. For David praised God with both voice and instruments ; David's Lord abandoned them, and praised Him with voice only. David ordered the Jewish church to praise God with both voice and instruments ; Paul ordered the Christian Church to praise Him with spirit and understanding. David recommended musical instruments ; Paul spoke of them with contempt. David's instruments terminated with the Temple, and were peculiar to its worship ; Paul's instruments are sealed in the charter of the Christian church, and had the patronage of David's Lord. Besides all this, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, being the institution of the Christian Church, we have for our example and guidance all the parts of Christian worship, viz.: *Prayer, Praise, Exhortation and Communion*. Till this juncture both instrumental and vocal music formed part of Divine worship, but at this turning point of abolishing Judaism and instituting Christianity, the Head of the Church, in presence of all its members, abandoned the former and retained the latter. His Apostles followed His example, and the primitive church adhered to that example of Christ and His Apostles for six-hundred and seventy years. Now, at that juncture of abolishing Judaism and of instituting the Christian church, why did the Head of the Church abandon the former and retain the latter ? and why did the primitive church adhere to that example for centuries ? is inexplicable if instrumental music is still permissive in Christian worship. The example of Christ and His Apostles with that of the primitive church, being the highest authority that we could have, is our only authority for the change of the Sabbath, we have the same authority for the change in the mode of praise ; if it is valid in the former, it must be valid and binding in the latter. Why, then, retain the one and discard the other ? if it be permissive to change the mode of praise, it must be permissive to change the Sabbath also. The bondage to which false brethren endeavored to bring Paul is the Jewish ritual, and lending the influence of his example to engraft the Jewish ritual on the Gentile converts is the sin for which Paul rebuked Peter. It is God's prerogative to prescribe His own worship. Christ, as Lord of the Sabbath, changed the Sabbath, and as Head and Law-giver of the Church, changed the mode of praise ; but man has no better right to change the mode of praise than the mode of prayer, nor to apply machinery to the service of praise than to the service of prayer, seeing that the Head of the Church prescribed the same instrument for both.—I. Cor. I⁴, xv. In view of these, combined with the undeniable fact that the ceremonial law and Temple service could not be kept according to God's appointment without Davidic instruments, which is an irrefragable proof that they formed part of it, and also that we have the same authority for rejecting instrumental music that we have for rejecting the Jewish Sabbath. Therefore we, with the primitive church of the first seven hundred years—the divines of the two Reformations—the true Church of Scotland from the time of Knox to the present—the Puritans and Covenanters who bedewed our simple scriptural worship with their tears and sealed it with their blood—conclude that instrumental music formed part of the beggarly elements that were taken out of the way and nailed to the Cross. “But,” say the pro-organists, “there is nothing in the Bible against instrumental music in Divine worship, and submitting to human authority in things indifferent for the sake of peace.” It may just as well be said that there is nothing in the Bible against fuming a cigar during Divine wor-

ship, or a bag-piper strutting in the chancel with his drones in order ; for most certainly it is as scriptural and as pleasant to see in a Christian assembly a Celt inflating his bag, screwing his drones, and modulating his chanter, as to witness a pianist or an organist flapping his bellows, twisting his keys, and adjusting the gear of his machinery. Nothing against it ? Tell what is against candles, crisms and crosses—against robes, vestments and holy water—the baptism of bells and quadrupeds and other trappings of an apostate church. Nay, more ; is there anything in Scripture against the marriage of father and daughter, except analogy?—Lev. 18. If analogy, then, is enough to prevent such union, much more should the example of Christ and His Apostles be enough to prevent such praise. “Nothing against it !” As the law of God is perfect, the silence of inspiration is much against it. The Head of the Church appointed two Sacraments in His Church, but he said nothing against seven. Then are the Romanists orthodox in their increase ? He commanded His disciples to baptize all nations, but He said nothing against the baptism of bells and quadrupeds. Then are the Romanists sound in extending this rite to inanimate objects ? According to this mode of interpretation, any number of additions may be made to the Divine Code, but the Bible says that nothing should be added.—Deu. 4, ii., Pr. 30, vi., Rev. 18, xix. But if there is nothing against it, tell what is for it ? What in the Old Testament but that it was used in connection with a system that was never perfect, that was local and typical and never intended to remain ? And what in the New Testament ? *Nothing*; for while we have precept and example for singing, for playing we have none, but the fashion of a selfish age, which subordinates the Divine to the human ? And what in history but the corruptions of Popery ? Whatever God commanded is not indifferent, for His own praise—the most solemn part of His worship—He prescribed not only the song but the instruments also. But it is not with God's silence that we have to do in the worship of the Deity, but with His commands ? and as to submitting to things indifferent (if there are such) it would be acknowledging in those who have assumed the office of government in the Church a power or right that the Head of the Church never gave them, the pretension to which is derogatory to His honour, and it would be surrendering the liberty wherewith Christ has made His people free, and in which they are commanded to stand fast. “Nothing against it !” This is Jesuitism to the core, confiding in negative rather than positive evidence, relying on the unwritten rather than on the written Word of God, preferring the silence of the witness to His solemn declaration. Is the example of Christ and His Apostles not against it ? Is the practice of the primitive Church for the first six hundred and seventy years, its opposition to it for the next six hundred years, and the fact that it is still opposed by the most pious of the land, not against it ? Is this not the very proof that we have for the change of the Sabbath, the example of Christ and His Apostles with the practice of the primitive Church ? If it is proof in the one, it must be proof in the other ; if it is ample proof for the change of the Sabbath, it must be ample proof for changing the mode of praise in the assembly of His saints. Suppose that the Israelites blood-stained the side-posts and upper parts of their doors according to order, and some other part without order, would that fulfil the command of God, meet his approbation, or pass with impunity, by stating that there was nothing against it ? Is it not evident that in all God's com-

mands there is a prohibition implied, from the fact that when God ordered Moses to speak to the rock that water might come out of it, he spoke to it as ordered by God, and also smote it without his order, for which smiting he sinned and forfeited the honour and privilege of entering the promised land; yet might Moses, in extenuation of his crime, plead before Jehovah that God said nothing against his smiting the rock. Moses outstretched his commission, did more than he was ordered to do, therefore sinned; so do we when we introduce, or attempt to introduce, into the Christian church what the Head did not order. It was thus by going beyond the parting injunction of the *Master Himself* that the Clergy in every age corrupted the Church.—Matt. 28, xx. The apostolic fathers were much opposed to instrumental music in Divine worship; so much so was this the case that they put allegorical interpretations on the texts that mentioned it—thus, the ten-stringed instrument signified the Decalogue, the psaltry the tongue, the lyre the mouth, the timbrel the resurrection of the body, the organ the body, the strings the nerves. The Apostolic Constitutions, an ancient book of high authority, excludes it, and in no ancient Liturgy has it any place. Clemens Romanus, the companion of St. Paul, was the first to establish the head singer to begin the Psalm and lead the assembly—(Pop. Cycl. Art. Singing)—yet there is no evidence that he either employed, recommended or permitted any instrument other than that of nature. About thirty-two years later, Justin Martyn says that singing with lifeless organs—musical instruments—is childish. About A.D. 360, Clement of Alexandria says that organs are fitter for beasts than for men. About A.D. 370, Basil says organs are the instruments of the race of Cain. About 380, Chrysostom says instrumental music was permitted to the Jews because of the imbecility of their souls, but instead of the organ we must use the body to praise God. About 400, Augustine and Jerome speak in the same strain. In 364, the Synod of Loadicea introduced regular songs which were sung by persons appointed for that purpose, yet there is no evidence that any instruments other than those of nature were employed, recommended or sanctioned. At the beginning of the 4th century, the Western Churches, through Ambrose, received a regular church music similar to the Eastern, and the information that we have about it tallies with the above. Pope Gregory the Great (590-604) put the first wedge in congregational singing. As to the Reformers, Luther says that organs are among the ensigns of Baal; Calvin says that instrumental music was not fitter to be adopted into the Christian Church than incense and the candlestick. The thirty-two commissioners appointed by King Edward VI. to report on the mode of worship condemned it. The petition that was presented to the Commons against it in 1562 was lost only by one vote. Knox said that the organ was but a chest of whistles. In the national Synod of Middleburg, 1581, and in that of Holland and Zealand in 1594, it was resolved to obtain the magistrate's authority to lay musical instruments aside and discontinue their use. During her purity, the Church of England, in her homilies on the time and place of prayer, strongly condemns it in Divine worship. The Puritans of England struggled against it, the retention of which was among the grievances that compelled many of them to resign their livings, being also one of the grievances which one thousand ministers of the Church of England, in a petition laid at the feet of King James in 1603, and for which two thousand, in the reign of Charles II., resigned their

livings.—Zuric Letters, Neal, His Puritans. The framers of the W. M. Confession of Faith were opposed to it, for in May, 1644, the Scotch Commissioners wrote to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland then in session, stating among other things, with thankfulness to God, that the great organs of St. Paul's and St. Peter's were removed.—Bailey's Letters. Nor does the W. Minister Confession of Faith afford the pro-organists any support for their pet idol; it enjoins that the worship of God be regulated by the positive commands of His Word, not by omissions. Its words anent-singing are: "In singing of Psalms the voice is to be tunably and gravely ordered, but the chief care must be to sing with the understanding and grace in the heart, making melody unto the Lord, that the whole congregation may join therein: everyone that can read is to have a Psalm Book." Hence we have a command for vocal and congregational singing, but for playing we have none. The committee of Divines appointed by Parliament in 1653 to draw up a list of Fundamentals, afforded no place for instrumental music, stating that God is to be worshipped according to His own will—hence with heart and voice. Fasting formed part of Jewish worship; Christ, His Apostles, and the primitive Church consecrated it by their example, but to instrumental music they afford no higher authority than to the Romish Mass.

*That Christianity was introduced into the British Isles by the Apostles and their contemporaries, that the Culdees were the primitive apostolic teachers of these isles from the time of the Apostles to the Reformation, that they taught the Bible faith and never submitted to the doctrines of the Church of Rome, although the Pope employed his selectest influence and profoundest machinations for that purpose; that, owing to their influence, the Pope's supremacy was not fully established in Scotland till the 10th, nor in Ireland till the 12th century; that they determined all disputes in doctrine by the Volume of Inspiration;

^{1.} The Gospel preached in Britain in the earliest times.—*Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Arnobius.*

^{2.} Preached in Britain before the defeat of Boadicea, A.D. 61.—*Gildas.*

^{3.} Preached among the Celtic nations, of which Britain was one, by the Apostles.—*Irenaeus.*

^{4.} Preached in Britain by the Apostles.—*Eusebius, Theodoret, Nicæphorus.*

^{5.} Preached in the extremity of the West by St. Paul.—*Clement Romanus.*

^{6.} Britain included in the West, and the boundary of the Gospel to the West.—*Catullus, Eusebius, Jerome, Arnobius, Theodoret.*

^{7.} Preached in Britain by St. Paul.—*Venantius, Fontonatus, Sophronius.*

^{8.} Preached in Britain by the disciples of St. John.—*Buchanan, Spotswood.* Confirmatory of Gildas' testimony.

^{9.} St. Paul sent to Rome in the 2nd year of Nero, A.D. 56.—*Eusebius, Jerome, Bede, Freccaphus, Ivo Platina, Magdaburgici, Petrus, Scalliger Capellus, Simson.*

^{10.} Pampania Graecina and Claudia Refina, two British ladies at Rome at that time.—*Tacitus, Martial.*

^{11.} Pampania Graecina accused of foreign superstition, A.D. 57.—*Tacitus.*

^{12.} Caractacus' family sent to Rome, A.D. 51.—*Tacitus.*

^{13.} Caractacus' family returned to Britain in A.D. 58 or 59.—*British Triads and Tacitus.*

^{14.} Paul's first imprisonment expired in A.D. 58 or 59.—*Acts of Apostles, 28, xxx., compared with Eusebius, Jerome.*

^{15.} Caractacus' father introduced Christianity to Britain.—*British Triads and Tacitus.*

^{16.} Baronius, on the authority of some manuscript in the Vatican, states that the Gospel was first preached in Britain A.D. 35, hence nine years before the organization of the Church of Rome.—*Jamieson, Bede, Stuart, Gordian, Ledwich, Usher.*

Caractacus was prisoner in Rome during two years of Paul's imprisonment there; both were liberated in 50. The British Triads state that three missionaries accompanied Bran, the father of Caractacus, to Britain.

that they would neither keep company with, nor eat, nor even remain in the same abode with the emissaries of Rome, maintaining as they did, that the Apostle John, from whose disciples they declared they received *their doctrine*, was in all respects equal to Peter, from whose disciples the Romish emissaries declared they received *theirs*; that they kept their faith and retained property till A.D. 1625, the time of the Reformation; that even then their ministers were in the habit of officiating as precursors in their assemblies, and there is no evidence that they used or sanctioned in Divine worship any instrument other than those of nature, are facts that can never be successfully disputed. Nor were these holy men indifferent to the character, qualifications, purity of doctrine and training of students for the ministry, from the fact that they were required to spend eighteen years at study before they could be admitted to ordination. Nor were they and their adherents insincere in their profession from the fact that in the beginning of the 4th century, during the Dioclesian persecution, not fewer than eight hundred and eighty-nine of them sealed their Christianity with their blood. Nor were they indifferent as to the mode of praise, seeing that in A.D. 620 not fewer than 1200 of their clergy fell in their opposition to the Gregorian chant when sent to the British churches.—McClintock Eccl. Art Psalmody. Add to this, that it was decided in the Apostolic Council (Acts 15) the parts of the ceremonial law that were not abolished, among which instrumental music had no place, and that Paul declares (Acts 20) that he taught the whole counsel of God, and kept nothing back that was profitable; but he did keep instrumental music back, therefore it is unprofitable in Divine worship and superadded; that according to our most reliable statisticians (Dieterici) the Eastern Church has eighty-nine million adherents who never admitted, and still repudiate any instrumental praise in Divine worship, except heart and voice. It is now over twelve hundred years since this relic of effete worship was introduced into the worship of an apostate church, and we see it still with tardy steps but climbing over the wall through the back door of expediency. The following are some of the objections that may be urged against its use in Divine worship:—(1) There is no evidence that it is acceptable to God; (2) It is a departure from Scripture foundation, for in the New Testament—the charter of the Christian church—there is not a single text that authorizes or permits its use in Divine worship by *precept, example, express words* or legitimate *inference*; (3) It is a violation of the 2nd and 4th commandments, playing not being a work of necessity or mercy; (4th) The Apostle Paul speaks of musical instruments with contempt, and the prophet Amos of Davidic instruments with disapprobation—Cor. 13, Amos 6; (5) It is engraving the Jewish ritual in Christian worship—lending the influence of his example to engrave the Jewish ritual on Gentile converts is the sin for which Paul rebuked Peter; (6) It is will-worship, an expedient for pleasing God which the Bible does not authorize, thus preferring the will of man to the will of God—Gal. 2, xi.; (7) It is worshipping God with artistic machinery, with proxy and with hands, instead of with heart and voice as God demands (Acts 17, xxv.) thus sinking the spiritual in the material, accommodating the pleasures of the world to those of religion, and reconciling God and Mammon; (8) It tends to destroy congregational singing, diverts the mind and attention of the audience from the proper object of worship, and destroys the harmony of congregations; (9) It is tampering with the conscience

of the weak, which is sin against Christ—I. Cor. 8, xii., xiii., Rom. 14, xxi.; (10) There is no provision for the expense of it, had it been of God's appointment He would have made provision for the expense of it, as under the Old Dispensation. The money expended on it should be devoted to missionary purposes. It is worthy of notice that in the ancient foundations of conventional, collegiate and cathedral churches, there is no provision for an organist; (11) It implies a deficiency in the New Testament as a rule of worship. impeaches the wisdom of Christ, and usurps His regal prerogative as King and Legislator of His Church; (12) It is opposed to the example of Christ and His Apostles, and contrary to the practice of the primitive Church and the doctrines of Divines of the two Re-formations; (13) There is no evidence on record that it ever produced spiritual impressions or generated holy affections, it only ministers to the animal tastes of man; (14) It involves the principle that the Church has power to institute as to manner and matter of worship, which principle lies at the foundation of all the persecutions and superstitions that ever spread over the Christian world; (15) It is one of the characteristics of the Mother of Harlots—Rev. 18; (16) It is worshipping God by artistic machinery, to worship the Deity with human machinery implying that God will accept the sound of brass to the emanations of a contrite heart is one of the most masterly assaults and profoundest wiles that ever Satan, in the garb of light, attempted on the Church of Christ since the expulsion of our first parents from Paradise; (17) It is a violation of the ordination vows of office bearers of the Presbyterian Church and a slur on the intellect of the primitive Christians, martyrs, reformers and fathers, who merit the highest respect and reverence of posterity, men of holy spirit and deadness to the world, who preached faithfully and fearlessly the truth as it is in Jesus, who lived for God and with God, and for the good of souls, who opposed error and innovations in every form, and whose acts are referred to difficulties and danger till the present time, who struggled, fought and died for the privileges which we now enjoy, bedewing them with their tears and sealing them with their blood, fathers whose religious and self-sacrificing achievements shed the highest honour on our nature, made us the envy of surrounding nations, and raised us to a pinnacle of greatness from which nothing but intestine foes can ever thrust us down, and shall we, their descendants, tamely foster this bastard of an Italian impostor, brought into the Church through the elastic valves of expediency when Christianity and Paganism were struggling for the ascendancy as the religion of the State, and terminated in a virtual compromise whereby the ritual of the latter was applied to illustrate the creed of the former. The incipient of error is like an avalanche that carries ruin and death in its progress; specious and gaudy in its approach, it captivates its admiring votaries with its fascinating hues, but while it captivates the eye it deceives the heart, and finally engulphs its votaries in ruin and woe. A glance at the progress of innovations in the Church of Rome will fully illustrate the matter. In the 1st century her faith was spoken of with approbation over the whole world; in the 2nd, she staggered; in the 3rd, she dallied; in the 4th, Mass was introduced; in the 5th, auricular confession; in the 6th, the Madonna and Purgatory; in the 7th, the title of universal bishop, the celibacy of the clergy, Latin into the ritual, the investiture of Bishops and the pallium; in the 8th, the worship of images; in the 9th, the assumption of the Madonna and the horrid doctrine of

transubstantiation; in the 10th, suffrages for the dead, commemoration of souls in purgatory, and the canonization of saints; in the 11th, Saturday was consecrated to Mary; in the 12th, the prohibition to translate the Bible to the vernacular tongue, and the increase of sacraments from two to seven; in the 13th, the Rosary and the Feast of Corpus Christi; in the 14th, Jubilee; in the 15th, the cup taken from the laity; in the 16th, sale of indulgences; in the 17th, infallibility of the Pope—till 1870 it was not defined whether infallibility was in the Church, Council, or Pope, or in these together; in the 18th, the Feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; in the 19th, the dedication of the month of May to Mary, the solemnity of the heart of Mary and the Immaculate Conception, and of the one hundred and twenty novelties^{*} of Romanism, nineteen-twentieths emanated from the Clergy. If such has been the progress of error, the fruits of innovations and their results from a small beginning in church whose faith and purity of worship were endorsed by the pen of inspiration, what better fate can any other church expect under the same pilotage, if she admit into her bosom through the elastic valves of expediency, the very adder that first allured and then stung her wayward sister to death. Indeed it was this baneful expediency of temporizing with Christianity for the accommodation of Paganism that first opened a door of admission for all the corruptions in the Church of Rome. Nor can we find in sacred history any wilful departure from the prescribed mode of worship or tampering with things sacred that passed with impunity. In the case of Aaron, his expediency to please the people resulted in the death of three thousand. In the case of Jeroboam, a similar offence cost him his kingdom. In the case of Urijah, his obsequiousness as man-pleaser and innovator is a disgrace to his memory and a warning to all who minister in holy things. The violation of God's prohibition to rebuild the walls of Jericho was punished with death five hundred and forty years after the threat was uttered. In fine, the singing of a well-trained choir is superior to and more

attractive than that of any instrument. We have good authority for stating that the singing in the church of St. Petersburgh is richer than that of any instrument. Wesley, a name that will always carry influence in anything aenent the praise of God, states in April, 1788, there were about 900 or 1000 present, and when they all sung together, and none of them out of tune, the melody was beyond that of any theatre, besides the spirit with which they sung, and the beauty of many of them so suits the melody, that I defy any to excel it, except the singing of angels in our Father's House. During the progress of the Reformation in Germany, the singing of a single hymn decided the adherence of a whole district to the Reformers, and in several other instances it decided the resolution of whole cities. Hence the remark of Cardinal Cajeton "that by the introduction of congregational singing (for before that it was confined to the priests and the choir) Luther accelerated the progress of the Reformation more than by all his sermons and publications." To maintain that any instrument of man's device equals one of God's creation in Divine worship contradicts itself and savours blasphemy. Besides, God has not only created the ear to delight in melody, but He has also created a most wonderful instrument of music for every man, which, when properly cultivated, has the command of every semitone and subdivision of note, swell, or trill, and not so exposed to injuries, nor so liable to imperfections as an artificial one, but is so clear, rich and sweet where well trained and used as to be the highest of comparison in these points for the flute, clarion, piano or organ. Add to this that vocal has many advantages over instrumental music, in the fine blending of its tones, in the endless variety of its intonations and expressiveness, and in the support which it derives from its contact with the soul. This is the true organ, the organ of nature, the organ David recommended for Christian singing, the organ of Christ and His Apostles and martyrs, an organ guided by the spirit and understanding, and inflated with every emotion of the soul.



EDD
O, 1, 1

